

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, February 20, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Stewart Millett and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Red River Exhibition Association.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 31, an Act to amend The Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the galleries, where there are seated some 32 Grade 5 students from Brock-Corydon School, under the direction of their teacher, Miss Mass. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. Also, there are some 60 Grade 8 students from Lord Kitchener School, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Melanchak and Mr. Martens. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Kildonan.

We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this be an inspiration to you, and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, Before the Orders of the Day, I should like to table the Annual Report of the Legislative Library, Province of Manitoba, for 1963.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, has this one already been sent out? If not, will copies be provided for all members of the House?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I don't think that copies were sent out, and if I'm correct in that, certainly copies will be made available for all members.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct two questions to the First Minister. Is it true that the Government has now received the Cummings Report, and is it true that the First Minister plans to table this report tomorrow?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): No, to both questions, Madam Speaker.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, on the same subject then, could the Minister inform us when we may expect these reports, because my original understanding was the Government indicated these would likely be available by the end of last year? Then the indications were that they would be available by sometime in mid-January before the House met. Then, I believe we were told shortly after the House would meet. Well, here we are now two weeks today when this House first assembled. The Government has not given us any indication yet when we can expect these two very important reports.

MR. ROBLIN: The answer is: "Very soon," Madam Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct another question to the First Minister. According to news reports, Mayor Stephen Juba has submitted a bill for 1.7 million dollars to the government for what he believes is money that was over-charged by Metro. Is it true that this bill has been sent to the government and does the government plan to pay this bill?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think that my honourable friend will recognize he's asking a question of policy, which is not in order.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I would like to offer a correction. The constituency of Brokenhead is small enough as it is and I wouldn't like to see it become smaller for the sake of Kildonan. The fact is that Lord Kitchener School is in Brokenhead.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Health? In view of the increase of tuberculosis cases this although the major part is in the Eskimos and the Indians, I would like to ask whether it's compulsory for the authorities to compel a patient who is a carrier to be confined to the hospital. And question

(Mr. Gray, cont'd). . . Number Two is whether they know of any cases that the patients don't want to stay in the hospital and they are still a danger to the public.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, all such cases are compelled to be placed in a hospital and to remain there until such time as the authorities consider them to be safe to mingle with the public.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General? On Page 27 of the Annual Reports of Gaols appears a statement which reads as follows: "Separate reports in detail have been submitted direct by the camp supervisors referring to the rehabilitation camps." Could we obtain copies of these reports? They don't appear in this report.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I think the reports referred to are not public reports, or reports that are required to be filed. I haven't seen the reports to which the Honourable Member has drawn our attention. I'll be glad to get one and make it available to the Honourable Member.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, for purposes of clarification, could the First Minister indicate whether this bill that Mayor Juba refers to has been sent to the government? Did he receive this bill?

MR. ROBLIN: I believe during my absence the letter was received in my office in connection with this matter.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, may I address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General? It is to do with the Boys Home at Portage la Prairie. Two questions. How many escapes have there been this year from the Boys Home, and what security measures, if any, are you taking to prevent further escapes?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I would ask the Honourable Member to give me those questions in writing. I'm quite unable to answer them off

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it true that the Minister is organizing a delegation from east of Portage la Prairie to come to press in favour of the Portage Diversion?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): It is not true.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is the Minister lending any financial or moral support to this delegation?

MR. HUTTON: The Minister is looking for some moral support.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, has the Minister discussed with any residents in the area the purpose of this delegation.

MR. HUTTON: I have been asked by people in the area if I would object to any demonstration by these people of their support for the Portage Diversion, and I can assure you that I assured them that I had no objection.

MR. MOLGAT: a subsequent question on the same subject. Is it not true that the Minister undertook to telephone some people in the area in this regard?

MR. HUTTON: That is not true.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Labour. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, just before the Honourable Member rises. If I could have permission of the House, I'd just like to make a comment about the order of business today. The Leader of the Opposition was good enough to tell me that he would be standing his adjournment on the budget debate, so we will therefore just proceed with the business in the normal course. Otherwise, I would have been glad to accord him precedence.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, speaking on the Bill, an Act respecting the Wages and Hours of Work of Persons employed in the Construction Industry, I have several comments to make.

First of all, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for providing me with the Blake report, so that I've had time to read it and discuss certain sections with some of my constituents who are interested in this legislation.

I find that the bill is a good one and that it meets the requirements of the people back home and those involved in the construction business. Section 3 makes various exceptions to

(Mr. Froese, don't'd)... people and to physicists to whom the bill will not apply, and I think they're quite in order. I noticed that the Blake report also refers to projects of 50,000 and under, but there is no mention of that in the bill, so I take it that there's no reference to that and therefore it will not apply.

Now, the bill has several principles, and I fully support the principle of having three different boards for the various areas that they will be in charge of. I feel that this has merit, because the men will have boards that will have particular interest in the various areas of construction, so that we will have a separate board for the rural area concerned. I think this speaks well for the legislation. However, the composition of these boards will be composed of both the employee and employer groups, and in addition there will be three other members, and here I'm wondering just what safeguards will be taken in securing unbiased people to represent or be represented on these boards. There's also three of them instead, I think, of the normal way of having committees where you just have an independent chairman. Is this just to take the chairman off the hooks so that he will have more support on the committee? I would like to know from the Minister just what is back of this, just why three independent members are supposed to act on these committees.

Section 10 refers to hearings that will have to be conducted annually before a report is made to the Minister. I would like to know from the Minister how many hearings are being conducted or will be conducted throughout the province every year, so that we will have some idea as to the area they will cover, and whether we can expect some hearings in a close neighborhood. Otherwise I feel that this legislation is good and I give my wholehearted support to it. Thank you.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, I don't think that I'm going to be quite as complimentary as the Honourable Member that has just taken his seat. For I see in the bill that we have before us -- an Act respecting the wages and hours of work of persons employed in the construction industry -- I see in the Bill that has been presented for our consideration the exact opposite of what the Honourable the First Minister presented to us in his budget speech yesterday as the attitude that governments should adopt respecting associations between labour and management. For, if one reads on page 15 of the speech of my honourable friend, the Provincial Treasurer, of yesterday, he mentions on this page the desirability -- the necessity -- of close co-operation between management, labour, and government in the whole field of activity -- related activity -- in the Province of Manitoba. My honourable friend takes pains to point out in his very flowery address that he gave us yesterday: "Permanent labour and management consultative groups now meet regularly with the Minister. Particular mention should be made of the consultative committee of employers and unions in the construction industry," then goes on to say, "New legislation covering wages and hours in this industry has been introduced."

My honourable friend is attempting, I suggest, Madam Speaker, to infer because of this that all is well insofar as the consultative groups in management and labour in the construction industry. I suggest just exactly the opposite, Madam Speaker. I join with the Honourable Member for Rhineland in thanking the Minister for a copy of the Blake report, which investigated the construction industry in Manitoba. But I see in the Blake report the exact opposite of the legislation that my honourable friend the Minister of Labour is proposing in Bill 29, because nowhere do we find any support whatsoever in the Blake report for the contention of my honourable friend the Minister of Labour as he is suggesting in the legislation that he is now proposing to us. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, it's just exactly the opposite, for if one takes a look at the appendage to the Blake report, titled Recommendations of the Special Committee of the Blake Commission, datelined August 20, 1963, we find that the special committee re construction industry study makes the following recommendations for consideration, as offering the best solution to the problem posed by the Fair Wage at the present time: 1. Retain The Fair Wage Act. 2. Leave the present Zone A as it now stands. 3. Extend Zone B to include all of the province outside of Zone A. 4. A single minimum fair wage should be determined by the Fair Wage Board which would apply in Zone B on contracts having a value not in excess of \$50,000. 5. Where contract values in Zone B are over \$50,000, Zone A rates and maximum hours will apply. 6. Maximum hours of work may differ between Zone A and B, except in the case of contracts in excess of \$50,000, and the Fair Wage Board should set

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... these maximums.

Now this, Madam Speaker, I suggest, were the recommendations of a special committee of Blake Commission and were recommendations that were made to the Minister of Labour. But we find nowhere in the bill that the Minister has presented to us concurrence with the recommendation of this committee. Now I say, I say to my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, it's quite all right, it's quite all right for him to reject the recommendations, but I say that it is not all right for him and his government and his colleagues in government to turn around and to say that one of the basic essentials for the harmonious conduct in the construction industry in the province is for joint meetings to arrive at solutions for the better conduct in the industry, and then reject them, as the Minister is doing in the bill that we have before us. I suggest, Madam Speaker, if this is going to be the attitude of government in respect to The Fair Wage Act, how in the name of heaven can they expect other groups in the province to offer their co-operation to the government in trying and attempting to arrive at solutions in other fields of endeavour as well? The joint committee of the construction industry itself and the employees, Madam Speaker, I suggest, are showing a greater spirit of co-operation between themselves than the government of Manitoba is showing to either one of them. And here we have a situation, Madam Speaker, contrary to the usual concept of labour-employer relations, where it is usually conceived or considered that labour and management are at each others throats at all times. Here in the construction industry we have an example of where management and labour have got together to make proposals, and the government, by the bill that is before us at the present time, are trying to prevent the harmonious relationship between management and labour. No-one in the construction industry, either insofar as management is concerned or insofar as the employees are concerned, have suggested at any time that the proposals as outlined in Bill 29, where there should be representatives of the public setting conditions under which the Act will operate, they've never suggested this. One of the basic factors and features of employer-employee relationship has been the fact that they get together. What is proposed in this bill? The Honourable the Minister of Labour is proposing that the Board, who is going to set the conditions of employment in the construction industry, is going to be dominated by what he calls, or the bill calls, "public representatives." And who, Madam Speaker, are the public representatives to be? Individuals appointed by the Minister of Labour. And I respectfully suggest this is a far cry from what is desired by the construction industry; this is a far cry from what is desired in harmonious labour-management relations.

As one studies the bill and sees the terminology, particularly in reference to the Greater Winnipeg area, one can see that what the Minister of Labour is attempting to do, Madam Speaker, in this bill, is to vulcanize labour in the Province of Manitoba. He is even changing the original concept of Zone A, confining it and, as I say, vulcanizing the whole industry in the Province of Manitoba. Further on in the bill mention is made of work that is performed off of sites, or on-site. I respectfully suggest to the Minister of Labour that he take this back and reconsider this whole aspect of this portion of the bill, because what can it mean in actual practice. In actual practice, Madam Speaker, I suggest that what it can mean is that where a contractor sets up on site a prefabricating area, providing it's not a factory, then he can pay whatever wages he likes, because it's just off of the site of the building being constructed properly. And I suggest to my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, I don't think he means this, but I respectfully suggest that that is what the Act, in effect, says, and that advantages will be taken of that particular clause in the agreement or in the legislation that we have before us.

Then again, there is protection in the bill as I read it, that where a contractor has entered into a contract with the government, that the employee is protected for payment of wages by direct requisite of the government itself. But such is not the case insofar as the employee is concerned on other types of contract that the government doesn't enter into. Here again, we are going to have, as I read the Act -- and I don't have to confess to this House that I am not learned in the law -- but as I read the present proposals of the Act, we are still going to have the self-same condition as we have at the present time, that where the onus is on the employee to sue or to prove in court that the employer owes him money, the net result being that the employee concerned is under prejudice of losing his job because the Act for a fair return, or a return, of his earnings from the employer. So as I say, Madam Speaker, as we study this bill,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... Bill 29, as proposed by the Honourable Minister of Labour, I reiterate and I repeat, this is going contrary to all of the lip service of co-operation between management, labour and government as expounded by my honourable friend the First Minister in his speech of yesterday, as expounded by many other spokesmen including the Minister of Labour, at labour conventions and the lot. And I respectfully suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Labour that he should withdraw this bill at this stage and renegotiate the matter with the construction industry -- and I'm happy to be able to say that I'm firmly convinced that when I say the construction industry today that I'm speaking both of labour and management who are united in opposition to this bill -- and I certainly will not join my honourable friend from Rhineland in supporting second reading of this bill.

MR. DONALD M. MCGREGOR (Virden): Madam Speaker, to start with I'll address myself as a grain farmer, and I realize the dangers in speaking to a labour bill when my field is within the agriculture area. But in all fairness I must say, and positively say this, everything I've got today I owe to labour, with probably two exceptions -- my wife and my very wonderful family -- reproduction thereof. I feel in all sincerity that I know probably as much about labour and management as any honourable gentleman in this Assembly and I step on no toes intentionally. If I do, I do with positiveness; and I'll take you to Halifax, I'll take you to B. C., and always in the labour field when I take you to these far-away provinces. I'll go to the extremes and if any honourable gentleman has any occasion to be in Halifax I can give you the address and the people who I associated with in that field. If I lose myself a moment, as this is my first try at saying without notes, and right now I must admit that I am just a wee bit at a loss, but then at least I'll come back to Manitoba in the labour field and what I hope to contribute to is labour and management relationship. I'll take you to the northern mines of Manitoba where I was certainly involved. I went into Sherritt-Gordon Mines in Sherridon in 1946, probably the finest town that I've ever associated myself with, at least in Canada. In 1947 came a strike and I was also in there. It was a challenge to me at all times. When my grain farming business ended I would take a train, a plane or a bus and go somewhere, whether it be Kimberley, in B. C., or Nickerson Crease in Halifax. It was a big wholesale firm. To me it was always a challenge to see -- can I be hired? Can I be fired? And I must say this -- in all the many -- I could have a list this long and I was only laid off once in my life and that was right in my home town of Kenton and it was done by Mr. Hoffman Construction out at Morris. The Honourable Member for Morris is not in the House, I believe, right at this point, but I was re-hired twenty-four hours later and I stayed there till the last dog was hung. However -- but my whole theme is trying to contribute something to our -- in fifteen years or twenty years of labour -- and I might also go back to Halifax -- I was known there, not as Maurice McGregor but as "old Scarface McGregor." It took a very good, nice job at Deer Lodge Hospital to remove a lot of scars -- I was very early in my twenties in those days -- I'm not too young any more.

-- I was very early in my twenties in those days -- I'm not too young any more.

MR. MCGREGOR: Madam Speaker, if I get out of base just call me to tune because I am rambling and I realize this. But to Sherridon. There was a situation -- a wonderful town and a wonderful management-labour situation -- a strike, and I'm not blaming union on this. I'm a supporter of union, but it was a few quick words by both management and labour that caused this strike. Anyone who was in this area would realize this. I do appreciate the Ministers going through their budgets of a year ago, whether it be the then Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that came into the fish, the mines -- the fish. And I ran a mink ranch out of Sherridon on Big Island in Cold Lake in 1947. But, however, all I would like to say in finishing this, if I could reach two percent of management and two percent of labour and make them understand how responsible we all are to try to bring labour and management just a wee bit closer together. I'm referring to this bill and I must pay tribute to the Minister of Labour for allowing me to speak on this bill. I feel I know both areas while today I'm not in the labour field and I probably could be accused of being in the management field and not too good a manager in this field probably, but I hope I can contribute something, and I would just close in thanking the Assembly for listening to these few words. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, that debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.
HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell)
presented Bill No. 26, an Act to assist Municipalities to Finance Capital Works, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: I thought perhaps my honourable friend might have had enough explanation the other day. When this matter was before committee the other day the Honourable Leader of the NDP suggested that perhaps there had been some delay on the part of the government and that there should have been a special session to introduce this particular piece of legislation. I therefore took some trouble to find out what the situation was in some of the other provinces; and the information would be that on the 17th of February there had been approved in Ontario, where they did have a special session, six loans for a total of \$632,257, and in Quebec, three loans for \$661,900.00. For the information of the House, Madam Speaker, up until the present time the Province of Manitoba has received and processed thirteen applications -- preliminary applications for loans -- for a total value of \$3,628,569 and these have been approved in principle. The projects have now been returned to the municipalities with a request that as soon as this legislation is passed, the form of agreement which will be entered into between the province and the municipalities and the applications for loans from Ottawa will then be forwarded by the province to Ottawa. Under this legislation Manitoba will borrow money from Ottawa for each loan and will in turn loan the money to the municipality.

MR. SCHREYER: May I ask a question of the Minister? He said that thirteen applications were processed. How many were approved? Or is that the same number?

MR. SMELLIE: Yes, of all the applications received to date there has been only one which has been held up pending information concerning grants that will be received from the federal and the provincial governments, which may affect the amount of the project that would be eligible for loan, and until those grants have been established and approved, then the application is just held pending. Of the others, thirteen have been received and processed and approved in principle.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I want to thank my honourable friend for informing the House as to the number of applications that have been received and been given consideration. It makes it quite interesting to me. A moment ago I was speaking of another Act and made reference to the speech of my honourable friend the Leader of the House yesterday, that Madam Speaker, dealt with the question of co-operation between labour and management.

I now want to take this opportunity, when we're discussing the Municipal Loan Fund Bill, to suggest that maybe the Honourable the First Minister and the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs should get together even on the question of Municipal Loans Fund, because if we read on page 17 of the address given by the Provincial Treasurer yesterday, we find on page 17, at the bottom of the Premier's speech these words: "To date, Madam Speaker, plans for more than 52 projects valued at \$26 million have been submitted to the province for consideration of the Municipal Development Loan Fund." When my honourable friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs was speaking the other day in reply to some of my questions regarding this matter, he stated on page 124 of Hansard that there were five proposals, now today my honourable friend says thirteen applications, valued at \$3,600,000. My whole point in rising at this time is an appeal, Madam Speaker, that possibly the members of the front bench had better do a little caucusing so that the members of this House are fully aware of actually what is happening in the business of the operation of the Province of Manitoba. I certainly am not going to oppose the bill, and I might say incidentally too that as I read the schedules to the bill the total aggregate amount allocated to the Province of Manitoba, on the whole loan, is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$20 million. I believe that's correct, so here again possibly the Honourable the First Minister didn't do his homework even with the schedules that he must have had before him, or should have had before him, when he was writing the address that he gave us so adequately and fluently yesterday.

MR. MOLLGAT: Madam Speaker, is the Minister closing the debate, because I have some questions that I would like to ask of him at this time? Could he give us the list of -- I'm asking a question now; I'm not making a speech insofar as this debate is concerned. Could he give us a list of the applications -- the thirteen that have been processed, giving us the municipality,

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... the project and the amount of money involved, and could he tell us if there have been any refusals, to date, of applications?

MR. SMELLIE: I think, Madam Speaker, that my honourable friend might ask for an Order for Return if he wants that information. There have been no refusals of formal applications to date. The other information I don't have completely before me, and I think that . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Well then, Madam Speaker, is the Minister going to close the debate at this time? -- Interjection -- In that case I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 28, an Act to amend the Amusements Act for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, for many years motion pictures have been classified as to suitability and this has been done by way of regulation giving authority to classify these films. The Amusement Act, under which the regulation is passed however, does not include authority for the making of regulations authorizing the classification of films, and the purpose of this amendment is to provide that authority.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, would it be correct to assume that this bill is a result of a recommendation that contained in the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, acting in his capacity as Chairman of the Statutory Committee on Regulations? Is that correct? I noted the recommendation contained in the proposed motion, and it appears as paragraph 5 on page 3 of today's Orders of the Day, and I notice that it is perhaps anticipating an explanation that my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would be giving, but I notice that it's suggested here that the provisions of the regulation relating to the classification of films are required to be repealed unless the Amusement Act is amended to provide the necessary authority for the provision. And I take it from the Minister that it has been held by the law officers of the Crown that no authority exists in the present act for regulation. And I was rather surprised to see that that was the fact, or alternatively, that the censor board itself did not have, under the Amusement Act, that authority. However if the Minister is convinced that that is the fact I suppose we should check into it at the committee stage rather than at this stage, though I was rather hoping that we would have the benefit of the act of accuracy of my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when he explained the proposed resolution. However, in the meantime I've no objection to it passing, and we can check the matter further in committee, or when the resolution of the honourable the Chairman of the Standing Committee is before the House.

MR. GRAY: May I ask the Honourable Minister a question? After this bill is passed, who would be the authority (1) to impose an amusement tax, (2) as to the amount of the amusement tax?

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, may I ask a question? Then the Minister could reply to both of them. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister that if a film were classified as unsuitable for children, what onus then ensues to the broadcasting company or to the TV station to announce beforehand that this film to be shown during the supper hour would be unsuitable. Is there any onus on the . . .

MR. STEINKOPF: clear it but my understanding is that they are not permitted to show those that are not suitable for children on TV.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 30, an Act to Make Uniform the Law respecting Wills, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Surrounded as I am by counsel all learned in the law, I take refuge in saying just two things -- first of all there is no principle in this bill, and secondly it's self-explanatory. We've had a Wills Act in Manitoba for quite a long time, and some years ago the Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation took under consideration the advisability of updating and re-drafting into modern language the uniform Act that was then in force in many of the provinces of Canada, including Manitoba. They engaged the services of, or were fortunate in securing the services of Dean Falconbridge, one of the outstanding men in this field in

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)... Canada, and I believe that it was in 1956 that he completed his re-draft of The Uniform Wills Act; and since that time there has been consideration given to bringing this Act into force in the Province of Manitoba. The new Act was considered by the law officers of the Province of Manitoba, and was submitted for consideration to the Law Reform Committee established by my predecessor, and comes on this occasion with the concurrence and the approval of the Law Reform Committee, and is submitted for the consideration of the House. Now, this Bill does not in any substantial manner or significant manner change the law. It is really a modernization of The Wills Act, more modern language and that sort of thing, but you will not find in it anything of any substantial or significant change from the law as it has existed under our statutes -- the statute up to this time. So that on that basis I put it forward as primarily a modernization, a revision, an up-to-date revision of our Wills Act. We have in Manitoba a provision in our Wills Act that I believe is not found in The Wills Acts in some of the other provinces, namely, provisions respecting holograph wills, and to this extent this is not part of The Uniform Bill, or Uniform Act, although again not any great significant change is made insofar as that portion of our Act is concerned, because we have provisions respecting holograph wills before and they are, of course -- that concept is continued here. My suggestion, to the House, Madam Speaker, would be that we might more usefully discuss matters of detail respecting this bill and there may well be some, in fact I am on notice from one of my colleagues learned in the law, about some matters of detail, and I'm not wanting to stop him from speaking but it did seem to me that perhaps the law amendments committee might be a better place to discuss matters of detail, particularly having to do with particular sections. And I would undertake, on that occasion, Madam Speaker, to, I hope, have available some member or members of the Law Reform Committee who worked on the revision with the law officers of the Crown, to perhaps be there for explanation or questions or whatever contribution they would like to make. And I certainly would wish it to be understood now that I'm not -- that amendments that might be agreed or can certainly come from the Law Amendments committee. In other words, if it receives second reading that is not to say that individual items cannot be changed if it seems important and advisable to do so.

MR. SAUL CHERNLACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Having heard what the Honourable Minister has said, I would have, with humbleness, refrained from speaking had I not had the modesty of thinking that I am not that learned in the law. However, since the Honourable Minister has insisted earlier this year on establishing the point that he thought that I was learned in the law then I thought possibly he was speaking to me. Nevertheless, I would like to endorse one of the references which he made and that is to the modernization of this Act, and I would like to suggest to all persons in this House that they might find it most useful and indeed illuminating to read this bill and compare it with the Act it replaces. Because the difference in the language is startling. It is most noticeable, and the reference made to modernization is justified, and will be, to any who read the phraseology used in the former Act and this one. But I think it would be wrong to suggest that the only purpose in this is uniformity because you never know how uniformity lasts. All provinces might agree on one Act and next year all provinces proceed to make amendments as they see fit and before you know it you are in need of a committee on uniformity to study all these Acts in order to bring about uniformity again. The point made by the Honourable Minister that amendments are possible, and that details can be discussed later, is one which I recognize but I would like to point out two principles as matters which I think ought to be studied in detail in law amendments, and I might suggest that both are worthy of consideration in the interval, so that when we do meet we are able to come with some thinking behind the discussion that we will have at that time. One is what I believe to be a departure from the present law, and that is the one which re-states the law that a person under 21 cannot make a valid will, unless he is on active service, and I never did understand why a person on active service suddenly acquired the maturity and the ability to make a will which ought to be valid when somebody who is not on active service is denied that recognition. But this goes further and says that if a man -- if a person I should say, man or woman is married, or has been married, and is under 21, he or she may make a valid will. This, to me, suggests that if somebody married before age 21 they automatically show a maturity, which entitles them to make a decision. I for one cannot accept marriage as being a recognition of maturity, and I even wonder as to the sense of this in terms of the fact that a

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd) ... person under 21 who is married, but whose will may not be valid, is a person who is bound to leave his estate to his heirs at law, who may be his wife and children, whereas if this Act is passed and he is under 21, and his will is valid, then he may cut out his children from sharing in his estate simply because he is now able to make a will. I probably have now confused the issue sufficiently to satisfy this committee that this section does require some study and thought prior to, and indeed at the time, when the committee deals with it.

The other point I'd like to make, Madam Speaker, is to repeat to the Honourable Minister his statement that in the main this bill is a clarification of the law and not so much a change, and to the extent that it is a clarification, and I think therefore an improvement on the re-statement of the law, I do not understand the insistence that it affect only wills which are executed subsequent to this Act coming into force. If indeed it is a clarification of the law as it stood, then surely it ought to be made to apply to wills which were drawn some time ago, and this is the second point which I wish to draw to the attention of the Minister and of the House.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I realize that ignorance is no excuse in law but there is something in the bill, unless -- I read the Bill as a commoner and not as a legal trained man -- but the two signatures signed as witnesses at a will innocently, unknowingly, that there was in the bill a certain paragraph in the witness' interest but as the patient expected in his own mind to die soon, ask him to witness the will which was not yet witnessed and not even signed, and he did -- I say, innocently. Then, when the will was probated, the lawyer for the estate told the interested parties that you don't have to carry out that section for that particular man who witnessed it because it was illegal for him to get anything while witnessing the will. Now this is done very innocently. Sometimes it's very hard to get a lawyer immediately to consult him, and very seldom does a man who does a favour to somebody expect anything for it -- altogether innocently. Now I think that this works a little bit of a hardship. I don't think there are many cases like this, but there are a lot of people who have no legal trained minds, perhaps more than those who have, and I think it works a hardship on them. So I thought perhaps the Attorney-General would give some thought about a problem that may appear once in a while, like this, dealing as I said, with people that don't know the law and they are doing it in a very friendly way to protect the man that wants to leave a will before he dies.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, it's amazing how we're inclined to put on the caps that fit us because I assumed when the Honourable the Minister referred to those learned in the law that he was speaking about me, and so I thought the least I could do under those circumstances would be to acknowledge the compliment.

I think I misunderstood something that the Minister said in moving the second reading of the bill, however, I thought he said that there had been a uniformity bill, or a bill emanating from the Committee on Uniformity, in 1056. Is that not correct? And I was thinking if that was the fact then the point made by the Honourable Member for St. Johns would certainly be valid, that even the uniformity bills can be changed pretty quickly.

I notice that we have, laid upon our desk today, a bill dealing with the Dower Act, and it is on it rather than this one that I wanted to make a representation, ask a question. In the meantime I would comment only on that section that has just been referred to by the Honourable Member for Inkster. I was hoping that I could see some evidence of this Act being a lot clearer than its predecessor and I had picked on that very section to compare with the old Act, and I would just ask any honourable member to read that section, either in the old Act or in the present one, and then tell us what it means, let alone calling one or the other simple or complex. The difficulty, I think, that has been mentioned by the Honourable Member for Inkster, can take place quite easily because this is something that I have noticed that many lawyers are not too sure about. However, to the extent that I think that I understand what the section means, and if I understood what the Honourable Member for Inkster is suggesting, then I could not agree with his suggestion because I think we should maintain the principle that either of the witnesses to the will -- a pretty important part, in anything but a holograph will -- that either through himself or his spouse, so that even though it were done innocently I think the principle should be maintained, and if the new Act makes that section more clear than the other then I think it's a big improvement. In general, I think it is advantageous to go along with the Committee on Uniformity because certainly a lot of people move from one part of the country to another and

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... even property can be held in various provinces and the question of domicile and everything else comes up, and the greatest degree possible there I think is advisable.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, from what has been said, members will realize that this bill is really self-explanatory. I think perhaps I may have not just put this correctly. I think Dean Falconbridge completed his work in 1956, since which time the commissioners on uniformity, who meet once a year, have been dealing with it. I think perhaps if I suggested that it's been in this form, or substantially in this form since 1956, that would not be entirely correct.

The point raised by the Honourable the Member for Inkster is an important one, although, as has been indicated by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, there are two sides to this question. Basically our law says that a signature to a will must be witnessed by two persons, both present at the same time and in the presence of each other, and this is to ensure the validity of this document, which is going to have such an important effect after the death of the person who makes it; and then the further precaution, which I think is a wise and sound one, that a person who is a witness may not have any interest, or may not receive any beneficial interest under the will. Now one may argue with that, that there are occasions when it may be perhaps difficult and unfortunate, but I think that from the standpoint of the administration of our law, it is probably a good one.

The Member for St. Johns has raised a question of age, and that is certainly a suitable one that we may discuss in committee. The other question he has raised with regard to the retroactivity of the bill, that is whether it ought to apply to wills made prior to the coming into force of this Act, is also a good one although I must say that on that point I would come down on the side of the provision in the bill which says that this law will only apply to wills made subsequent to the making of the Act, because surely if, as the Honourable the Member for Inkster says, we're all presumed to know the law, if a person made his will last month he must be presumed to have made it under the law as it existed at that time and that he's only really bound by the provisions of this Act after it has in fact become part of the statute law of the province. This will make a good debating point I'm certain, but I think it's an important principle -- this principle of retroactivity -- that we must watch very closely, and generally speaking, I would not be in favour of changing what I think is a fairly basic approach on that question.

MR. SCHREYER: I understand that the Minister has closed the debate but could I direct a question to him if it's in order? I would simply like to know why it is that they persist to continue using foreign terminology -- not Latin but other foreign terminology -- in legal drafting; and secondly, why is it that part of the Act is going to be proclaimed at one time and another part of the Act proclaimed later apparently.

MR. McLEAN: I think, Madam Speaker, it doesn't necessarily follow that it won't all come into force at the same time or approximately the same time. This is an administrative function only there and, Madam Speaker, if I may say so, if us lawyers gave away and talked only in ordinary English how would we ever charge any bills?

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 32, an Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Well, Madam Speaker, I think the explanation that is given on the fly-leaf of the bill is as accurate as any I can give, and probably a great deal briefer but since they wish to have an explanation, I would say that these amendments are carried out -- No. 1, to bring the Act into conformity with what the people in the Department of Municipal Affairs believe is the proper procedure for the municipalities to follow in providing funds for the weed-control districts. It also provides for the inclusion of Local Government District land in weed-control districts. It amends some of the language that is used to make the Act a little more flexible insofar as the member municipalities are concerned. One important section deals with a problem that has arisen in the Interlake in the case of occurrence of a weed known as red bartsia. This weed was introduced into Manitoba through very simple accident. Seeds of the plant apparently were in packing used in shipping personal effects from Europe over to the Gimli airport and these seeds were scattered on the airport and from there have spread quite extensively. The Department carried out a very detailed survey in the Interlake this summer to try and identify all the outbreaks or infestation. We feel that we have it pretty well pinpointed,

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)... and we are now in the process of organizing an all-out campaign to eradicate this weed before it can spread to other parts of the province. In many respects red bartsia is much like leafy spurge and leafy spurge is no stranger to Manitoba and has cost this province millions and millions of dollars. So these provisions try to provide for keeping this red bartsia and leafy spurge and any other noxious weed that may from time to time come to light, or become a problem, to keep these weeds confined to an area where they can be dealt with and eliminated.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct some questions to the Minister if I may. As I understand the bill, that any farmer selling hay with either red bartsia or leafy spurge is liable for prosecution.

MR. HUTTON: Have you any other questions?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, I was just going to ... Up in my constituency, a lot of the farmers sell hay in Winnipeg, and I was just concerned what effect this bill would have on them. I thought it might be conceivable that these farmers who sell a lot of hay could innocently be transporting hay with these noxious weeds and not be aware of it, and it's my interpretation of the Act that if they were found -- their hayload were found to have this weed, they could be prosecuted under this bill.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, may I say that when I looked at the bill I got the very same impression, and I noticed that the Minister was nodding his head in the negative, but I wish that he would be doubly sure that that's what he really means, because if you read the Act, or the bill rather, it does seem to be rather specific on that point, and in fact it does leave up to regulations any further prescription as to what may or may not be prohibited, and I'm wondering if, in the event that it is proclaimed, do we seriously believe that it's enforceable. It seems like a very difficult statute to have to enforce with any kind of consistency. And secondly, I get the impression that there is some rearrangement here as to whom the weed inspector is having to report to. I take it that where municipalities at the present time have a weed inspector that he would still be reporting to the council and this wouldn't be changed, I presume.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the bill contains a number of different items as difficult to discuss -- the principle as such in the broad form. I think we have to take the position the Minister did and discuss it in detail, because the principles vary. The one that I'm interested in is the one that has been spoken on by the two members so far, and that's the section 9, being prohibition on the sale. Now, this is a very specific proposition, Madam Speaker, because it says simply, "no person, firm or corporation shall offer for sale or sell hay or other fodder containing these two weeds, the leafy spurge and the red bartsia." And this simply puts these people in a position where someone may quite innocently be offering for sale hay that he has no idea contains either of these weeds, and yet he's open to prosecution. Similarly, under the next section -- any inspector may prohibit the movement of hay or fodder containing these, and any person ... moves hay or fodder is guilty of an offence under this section. Now, I submit that this could have very serious effects on the movement of hay and fodder in the province, because the farmers themselves in many cases will not know whether their hay does contain either of the weeds. My understanding is that the red barksia is mainly in the Interlake and in the vicinity of Gimli airport, but that leafy spurge is prevalent in other parts of the province as well. It seems to me the Minister should take into consideration here some less stringent regulations with regards to either warnings or inspections or having the agricultural representatives declare certain areas clear, or some means of permitting the farmers to know in advance where he stands on any of this hay. There are further problems arise. For example, the movement of hay from outside of the province. What happens with hay coming here from Saskatchewan? Does the government intend to have inspectors examining hay and fodder coming across the provincial border? What about the movement of hay from the United States? Now, we have had periods where we have had to import substantial quantities of hay from other areas. Some two years ago we were very concerned here in the Province of Manitoba, and what would happen in cases of that sort? Has the Minister considered any means of compensation? Let us assume that certain loads, certain fields are declared contaminated. What is the situation then if the farmer has proceeded to bale this and is in the process of transporting it quite innocently? Does the Minister intend to provide any

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... compensation when he, by regulation, says that the farmer cannot, not only sell it, but he can't even offer it for sale. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that we have to look a little further in this Section 9 as to the effects and where this can lead to. I'm not going to oppose the bill going to committee, but I would like the Minister to take this matter into consideration and have his people there ready to explain exactly how they intend to proceed on this. My understanding is that the red bartsia in particular is an extremely dangerous weed. I'm told by people in the Interlake that the government has not been sufficiently active in controlling the weed; that there hasn't been sufficient co-operation between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Public Works, in particular. The Department of Agriculture is, I understand, trying hard to do the control but Public Works on the road allowances and the areas for which it is responsible, is not prepared to co-operate. My understanding is that the result of this is that the weed is extending further and further in the Interlake area and can contaminate what is for the Province of Manitoba a most important feed and fodder section.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to add a word to what has been said here. The purpose of the amendment is quite evident. It's to stop the spread of these two weeds. But is it going to be effective? I wonder, Madam Speaker, how much of this weed is spread by having cereal grains transported from the farms to the various elevators; unless this weed will not grow in cereal crops. Then of course that wouldn't be an argument at all. But if it does, there's just as much danger, if not more danger, having the weed-seed spread when grain is being transported that there is when hay is transported, because hay is generally cut before the weeds are matured. In the grain the weed would be matured and would be found in the grain during transportation, and I think that if the Honourable Minister wishes to stop the spread of this weed he'd have to make that provision considerably wider than what we have in this bill.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I see another problem arising in addition to what the Leader of the Opposition already mentioned, and that is that, particularly in the southern area, you have a lot of farmers in specialized crops, and therefore do not have any cattle and as a result do not need the fodder and will give away fields to other farmers who will then cut it and store it for their own purposes. Now, they wouldn't be contravening the first section, but they could be charged under the second section of No. 9, and without even knowing that such a weed was on their plot or that these weeds were contained in that particular hay and as a result could be charged. I feel that this needs further investigation and changes.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, if the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition doesn't like this section of the Act or this proposed amendment, I wonder where he was in 1954 when the revised statutes of the Province of Manitoba were coming under the scrutiny of the Legislature of that day, because this is no departure of principle at all. It's not even a departure in phraseology. The only change is the addition of red bartsia because the sections or clauses that he objects to have been on the statute books for many, many years and indeed almost in the exact present wording; so if he wants to know what happened over all these years all he has to do is look around and see what has been the result.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I will have to ask for the co-operation of the press gallery. If you wish to speak, speak in a very low tone so that the member speaking will have the opportunity of being heard.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I think I can share any member's apprehension about laws that can prove to be very impractical and to work a hardship on people if they were administered without some exercise of judgment. The Act, I believe, is quite explicit that it is only after an individual has done a particular act in direct contravention to an order of an inspector that they would become liable under the law.

As I say, this law has been on the statute books for many years because weed control has been a problem in the Province of Manitoba for many years. The annual losses even today from weeds is estimated to be \$40 million in the Provinces of Manitoba, or an average loss of \$1,000 for every one of our 40,000 farms, and when the stakes are so high, both for the province as a whole and for the farmers as individuals, I think that we have to have some regulations to make sure that the efforts of some are not undone by the callous indifference of others. The suggestion has been made that the problem with red bartsia -- the fault lies with

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) . . . this government. I'm not going to deal with that at the present time, Madam Speaker, because I don't think it has very much to do with the principle of the bill that is before us. I'll be happy to discuss that in the agricultural estimates.

I think that the points that have been raised, and particularly this point of the need or desire for regulation, is one that can be discussed in committee and I would be happy to do so at that time. I would ask the Legislature to support these amendments.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 37, an Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, an explanation herein will again please those learned in the law. It seems to be that kind of an afternoon. My colleagues and I have been concerned for some time about certain anomalies between the statutes which constituted Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone System on the one hand and the procedures which have been followed in the matter of having the boards of the corporations report upon their stewardship. In effect, the management of important affairs has been delegated by legislation directly to certain boards of management without, in our opinion sufficient provision for detailed accounting by these boards to the Legislature. It is the view of this administration, as I am sure it was the view of the legislatures which originally established proprietary corporations such as Manitoba Telephone System and the Manitoba Power Commission, the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, and more recently the Manitoba Hydro, that the boards appointed under these statutes and which were given very wide powers by those statutes, would be expected to hold themselves completely accountable to the Legislature for the exercise of those powers and for the discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to them. I'm sure we will accept this principle, and our concern is not really one of principle as we see it but rather one of mechanics. What are the mechanisms through which corporations such as Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone System can be held to account more completely and in greater detail to the Legislature and its committees. Under the statutes as they stand at present, most of the powers and authorities confirm, are exercisable by the respective boards without the necessity of ministerial approval. Generally these powers and authorities have to do with the day to day management and operation of the utilities. On the other hand the powers and authorities of the boards exercisable by them with ministerial approval have to do basically with extraordinary matters such as extra-provincial operations or transactions, the borrowing of money, the issuing of securities and the expropriation of existing utilities and of lands. The statutory obligation of the two corporations to account to the Legislature and its members is at present limited to making an annual report to the Minister, which is laid by him before this Assembly. This does not, in our opinion, secure the degree of accountability by the corporations to the Legislature that seems desirable in the public interest. In considering this question of how best to achieve a higher degree of accountability by these boards to the Legislature and its Committees, we have been much helped by conferences with senior officers of the Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Telephone System. We have also taken the time to study in some detail the experiences gained in other jurisdictions, such as the United Kingdom, where a number of large nationalized industries are administered by boards of management, and in Ottawa where the boards of Canadian National Railways and Trans-Canada Airlines, for example, occupy somewhat similar positions in relation to governmental bodies in Canada as to Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone System in Manitoba.

As an outcome of these conferences, these studies, and our close consideration of this matter of achieving a greater degree of accountability, we now have a number of proposals to make as would be provided in certain amendments to The Manitoba Hydro Act and The Manitoba Telephone Act. The annual reports of the two corporations, the Hydro and the Telephone, would be regularly referred to and be considered by the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources. It would be understood, of course, that appropriate board members and officers of the relevant corporations would be present or could be called before such committee to be questioned concerning the subject matter of the reports or other aspects of the utilities. Members of the Legislature will be given an opportunity in this way to raise any questions of and to seek any information from the appropriate officers of the corporations

(Mr. Steinkopf, cont'd)... concerned. Accordingly, it will be our intention when any such questions are asked or information sought after, not to attempt detailed answers from the government benches, but rather to arrange for an appearance before the appropriate committee of the board members and officers of the corporation concerned.

In addition to matters arising out of reports, etc. it would be the intention of the government to have all other questions relating to the operation of the utilities referred to the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, as well as to arrange for the appearance of the appropriate board members and officers. The foregoing will perhaps serve as an outline of the thinking as well as of the intentions of the government in the matter of obtaining a higher degree of accountability by the boards of our two large utility corporations, as well as upon the methods for which this closer accounting can be achieved. In harmony with this thinking, and with these proposals in effect, it will not be the intention of the Ministers henceforth to attempt answers to questions pertaining to matters which by the terms of the statutes have been delegated to the boards of the utility corporations. On the other hand, the Ministers will be ready to facilitate the inquiry into such questions by the appropriate committee and to assure the presence of the proper board members and officers of the corporation before that committee. For questions relating to subject matter, which by statute has been placed under the control of the Minister or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, such questions would be addressed to the Minister as in the ordinary course.

I'd like to assure honourable members that there are no differences of view between the boards of these utilities and the government on the matters which I've been discussing. No man who in the capacity of an agent runs a business for another, wants any long time to elapse between his periodic accounting. In this same sense, as I understand them, the members of the boards of these large and important corporations are wholly in agreement with the government in our desire to provide a proper form for this accounting at least once every year.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I had hoped when I first saw these bills, and the provisions that they covered, that is, both Bill 37 and 38 which cover the same thing, that the intention of the government was not to duck answers and questions here in the House, but rather to provide the members with more information, and that this would simply mean that we would have once a year the opportunity of discussing the utilities with the people concerned. But the Minister's statement this afternoon tells us in effect, Madam Speaker, that the government does not want to take responsibility for the public utilities here in this House. The government, I find, is very prepared to take responsibility for the public utilities when there is a political advantage for the government. For example, in December and November of 1962, my honourable friends across the way were quite prepared to call an election supposedly on the basis of the development of the Nelson power project. At that time we heard nothing about the Hydro Electric Board proceeding with the Hydro power project on the Nelson River. It was my honourable friends across the way. It was the government who was going to do this. They were quite prepared, at that stage, to take all the credit that goes with it, but the moment, Madam Speaker, that difficulties arise, such as the debates we had last year here on Grand Rapids, then my honourable friends want to scurry away just as far as they can from their responsibilities, and I for one am not prepared to accept this position. I am not prepared to vote for either of these two bills if that is the intention of this government. I certainly have no objection to having the reports of the two commissions referred to the Public Utility Committee. Quite happy to appear there and ask the questions, but I am not prepared to have this brought in with the statement that the Minister made that we will be precluded in this House for asking any and every question that we want on these boards and utilities. Because, Madam Speaker, should we accept this statement, what does it mean? What's the purpose then of having a Minister of Public Utilities. If it's the intention of the government to remove this Ministry, this is a different proposition. What about my honourable friends appointing members of this House on these two utilities? My honourable friends have their direct control by having members of their party sitting as members of those commissions and those boards. My honourable friend suggests that they are not in closer contact than the remainder of this House. Surely the issue here, Madam Speaker, is one of government responsibility, and I submit that the statement made by the Minister on this occasion is an attempt by supposedly giving us more information, of the government absolving itself of its responsibilities whenever it sees fit and it sees an advantage to do so. I refuse to support either of these two bills.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I am somewhat surprised, amused, and delighted to hear the last oration from my honourable friend, the Leader of the Official Opposition, particularly when he refers to the part in the statutes dealing with the two utilities under question as to having on the provision in the legislation for members of this assembly being on the board, because if memory serves me right it was during the regime of his honourable colleagues that such provision was placed on the statute books, and if I recall correctly also Madam Speaker, at a recent revision within the last two or three years of the Acts themselves, I stood alone with my group in opposition to the fact that there were representatives or members of the Legislative Assembly on these boards. My honourable friend, at that time, if I recall correctly, supported the contention of the government that it was quite in order that members of the Legislature should be also entitled to sit as members of these commissions. I beg your pardon? He didn't deny it today but he raised the objection because they were there. Oh, you certainly did. Oh, I heard my honourable friend, and if you want to misinterpret what he says, I'm interpreting it correctly. Now then, I can understand too why my honourable friend might take objection to some of the proposals. I might say that I think, as far as I'm concerned, that I'm going to accept the statement of the Minister with a reservation or two. My reservation is, and I don't think that I heard him wrong, was the inference -- and the Honourable Member who just took his seat inferred this, that it seemed, at least at one stage of the Minister of Public Utilities' statement, that he would not be answerable in this House. Now I think that that's not right. He will be answerable in this House. This also pinpoints what I said yesterday afternoon in committee, Madam Speaker, of it being desirable to have the heads of our various departments here in the House so that they could answer the questions. Now, this is just a little bit in reverse that this automatically is going to be referred to a committee so that we are assured, without asking the government or pleading with the government, to have the boards and commission heads attend at a meeting in order that we may hear it. I think this really and frankly is a step in the right direction. It is a directive now. It will be statutory that the committee will meet to hear the reports. The only thing I want to be assured of is that when we are referring to the legislation, while it is as a follow-up of section 47 of the Act -- the tabling of the report -- it's actually dealing with a report that can be four or five months old. I would like to have the assurance of the Minister that when the heads of the commission appear before the Public Utilities Committee of this House that there will be absolute freedom to bring any question that we have right up-to-date, even to newspaper articles that might appear the day before the committee meets, and that the commission would be responsible, not just merely, Madam Speaker, to scrutinize the reports as such that is tabled. Now, if I can have the assurance of the Minister and the government that it will be wide open on all aspects of the operation of the committee or commission and not just the report that is tabled, then I'm prepared to accept the legislation proposed.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, when I read the Throne Speech and heard of the intention of the government to give this legislature better insight and more knowledge from the utilities themselves, I welcomed the idea. However, on hearing the Minister speak on the bill today, I certainly could not go along if we're, as members, going to be prevented from asking the Minister in charge of any information from time to time that we need in the House. Certainly, I think we're the losers on this occasion if we vote for this Bill. So, on that basis I certainly object to the legislation.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Ethelbert Plains, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 38, an Act to amend the Manitoba Hydro Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 8, an Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Is the Minister going to give us an explanation, Madam Speaker?

MR. SMELLIE: Well, Madam Speaker, I thought this matter had been explained in committee when the bill was first introduced. There are two things involved in this bill. The first is to provide for the payment to local government districts of monies received by the province for rentals of lands owned by the local government districts, and the second is to allow the supervisor of local government districts and his assistant to sign documents on behalf of the Minister, dealing particularly with local government districts.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I just want to ask a question of the Minister and that is why I wanted the explanation from him, because that now I have the bill I have been able to relate it to the Act itself. Now, my question is this, as I understand the Act at present, the government can get an assignment of the land insofar as the land itself, but the Act says nothing about the revenues, at least I couldn't see it in those sections. Now this section 1(a) says what is going to happen to the revenue but it will be laid out in the Order-in-Council, but what is the intention of the government insofar as the revenue -- is it definitely to have that revenue sent to the local government districts? This is the assurance I would like.

MR. SMELLIE: If there are no further questions, Madam Speaker, that is the intention of the government that the revenue received from lands now owned by the local government districts, and which are rented under Department of Mines and Natural Resources under the new leasing policy, all of that revenue will be turned over to the local government districts.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. WITNEY presented Bill No. 24, an Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, there are schedules at the end of The Pharmaceutical Act which are being rescinded and new ones being added. This is being done because the schedules have not been amended since 1954, and since that time there have been countless new drugs and poisons and other drug items that have been introduced to the public and to the professional market, and this is a matter of clarification for the pharmacists themselves. Secondly, since the operation of the poison control centres in the province, a considerable body of experience has been registered with respect to regulatory steps such as labelling, identification, sale restriction, etc., and these are incorporated in the recommendations at any rate, after consultation by the pharmacists and the poison control committees; these recommendations have been added and incorporated in the schedules that are being amended. There is also the need in the changing times where we have changing patterns of business, and shopping habits to delete one section and that was a section which stated that certain drugs could not be sold within the three-mile radius of a pharmaceutical chemist. That section is being rescinded. The other provinces across Canada are also rescinding their various schedules. The Province of B.C., and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia we understand have already done so, and that similar legislation is being planned for Alberta and Ontario, so that these schedules will conform with other schedules of provincial Acts which it hopes will aid in the operation of this legislation. The schedules have been revised in consultation with the head of the School of Pharmacy at the University, and have also as I have advised you, been done in consultation with the poison control centres; and the schedules also contain all the drugs that are listed in Parts 1 and 2 of schedule G of the regulations under The Food and Drug Act. The Schedule A in Parts 1 lists the drugs that can be sold only upon prescription. Part 2 lists those drugs that can only be sold to a person known to the pharmacist after being properly labelled and entered in the book of poisons. And the Schedule 3, or Part 3 of Schedule A, are those drugs that may be sold by a licensed pharmacist to any person with the proper labelling -- labelled "poison". And in Schedule B, the articles that may be sold to any person provided they are properly labelled. And then on Schedule B, Part 2, the articles that may be sold by any person subject to The Pest Control Products of Canada Act, and The Manitoba Pesticides Control Act.

MR. GRAY: Question No. 1 to the Minister of Health. The prices of the so called -- its all patent medicine more or less; they call it patent medicine. It's medicine which has been prepared by the pharmaceutical establishments and sold to the druggists for the sale to the

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) public. Is there a control over the price charged for each one?

No. 2. Those medicines that don't require a prescription -- where are they meant to get it, also in a drug store, isn't it? They couldn't go down and get it anywhere else. In other words, my point is, whether a prescription usually charged more than a non-prescription. It's a good thing for them to allow them to buy certain medicines without a prescription in order to save them money, but who is to sell it? Where are they going to buy it? Also in a drug store, isn't it? There's nowhere else they could get it. I mean, they couldn't go to the hardware store and get it. They couldn't go to Woolworth's store and get it, so they probably have to get it somewhere, and what assurance have they got that this is a medicine, if you don't buy it at a drug store. In other words, I cannot pronounce a single line here, but supposing that a man required a certain medicine, how does the man know and if he's without a prescription, how does he know whether this is the medicine that they require. In other words, while they are making it easier for the people to get the medicine, they are still compelling them to go to a doctor and make sure this is the medicine, which is another expense.

And the third question I think you answered, is that you got the information from the pharmaceutical association. My question only is whether it's sufficient; after all, this is the law, this is a bill. Is the advice of the pharmaceutical associations who are interested to sell the drugs good enough or they may apply to some higher authorities?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable Minister. I was looking at Schedule A, Part 1 -- certain drugs that can only be sold on prescription -- and I noticed that they can be sold on the prescription of a medical practitioner, veterinary surgeon or dentist, and I would refer the Minister specifically to the last item on the bottom of Page 3, and ask him why a veterinary surgeon and dentist should have the right to dispense by prescription that particular drug.

MR. WITNEY: What is that drug?

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I think that the last speaker need not be too concerned about this, because I was intrigued enough to look into Section 32 of the Act itself, and it seems to me that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can quickly change these schedules by regulation, and I am wondering to what extent the various schedules have been changed from the time that they were enacted back in the revised statutes of 1954. For example, if there was no change made since 1954, then people selling aspirin today in this city who are not pharmacists are apparently breaking the law. There are other drugs referred to in the old Act. I call them drugs, for want of my knowledge of a more correct term -- pharmaceuticals, anyway -- which could not be sold by any person who was within three miles of a licensed chemist; and if it has been changed, of course this is out of date. But I point out that I wonder if this Schedule, being part of the Act at all, since apparently under Section 32, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, upon application of the Council of Pharmacists could change all these schedules, re-vamp them by either addition, deletion or change.

But I am more interested in looking at Schedule B, and noting that there could be freedom of sale. And incidentally, the Honourable Minister used the term "may be sold to any person." He meant I'm sure "may be sold by any person" providing that they are labelled as indicated in this schedule. And you'll note that in most cases, they have to be labelled "poison"; in other cases, they don't have to be labelled except apparently by the name -- I presume it's what you would call the generic name or the common name. But I'm most interested in the item dealing with acetylsalicylic acid which must have an item marked "caution -- keep out of reach of children." And I would have expected to find there the term that this too ought to apply to cigarettes, and if it doesn't, I'm wondering whether the Honourable Minister overlooked including cigarettes in this schedule with this type of protection for children in the light of what he knows, and we all know, about the danger that is accepted now that cigarettes are to the human being, and particularly to the child who has not yet learned to smoke and acquired a habit which he cannot break. So, may I urgently urge the Honourable Minister to consider carefully the feasibility of coming in by way of amendment to Law Amendments Committee or whatever committee would deal with this, with the suggestion that the item of cigarettes be included in this schedule.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, if there are no further questions -- in reply to the question of the honourable member for Inkster, the Act does not provide for any control of price. Prescription drugs can be sold by a licensed pharmacist only, and I would suggest to anybody

(Mr. Witney, cont'd.) . . . who desires to have a particular type of drug, that because of the dangers that are involved in using them, that he see his doctor before he takes any chances.

The question with respect to the Honourable Member for Selkirk, his modesty leaves me rather modest too -- to not take it any further at this juncture.

And in relation to the questions of the last speaker, tobacco has not been considered and in view of the consultations that are going on between the province and Ottawa at the present time, I would not be prepared to recommend tobacco for consideration by this Act, at this juncture at any rate, but I can draw the suggestion of the Honourable Member to Manitoba is representative on the Advisory Committee at Ottawa.

And in relation to the change of regulation, to my knowledge there has been no regulations passed since 1954 making any changes to the schedules that are here, but I can clarify that for future reference when we take this bill to the committee.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HONOURABLE STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that this House doth concur in the Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders dealing with the draft of an Act known as The Constitution of Canada Amendment Act, received by the Legislature of Manitoba on Monday the tenth day of February, 1964, and which reads as is shown in the Order Paper of today.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, it is not my intention at this time to go into a long or detailed rehearsal of the matters which led up to the formation of this committee, and of the detailed working of the committee during the time that it sat. Suffice it to say that the committee arose from a 1960/61 series of conferences convened by the then Minister of Justice and the various Attorneys-General of Canada. From that conference, there emerged the draft constitution of Canada Amendment Act, which while not unanimously agreed upon by all of the participants of the conference, did represent a level of agreement which had been achieved in these federal-provincial discussions. This draft Act was brought back to Manitoba, was referred to a committee, the Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations in 1962. There was a committee meeting held for the purpose of hearing representations with respect to the Act. I believe at that committee meeting, the first one in 1962, we heard from a professor of law from the University of Manitoba, and we received a letter from one other group in Manitoba. Subsequently, this particular committee set up by that legislature, was dissolved by reason of the writ of election which issued in November of 1962. With the session of last year the committee was reconstituted and the Act referred back to the committee. At that time, the administration at Ottawa, not having changed and there still being some interest in this proposed draft Amendment Act which had emerged from the discussion. There was, I am told, a federal election last April, I believe it was, and there was a change of government at Ottawa. The committee persevered nonetheless, and in the face of this abnormal difficulty and continued to hold a hearing with respect to The draft Amendment Act. At that hearing there was given the representation which is detailed in the committee's report and really it was a recapitulation of what the professor of law had said, and there were two other persons who made all representations to the committee.

With the coming of the new administration at Ottawa, there was a statement made by the former Minister of Justice, the Honourable Leon O. Chevrier, at the Bar Convention in Banff, September of 1963 of just last year, that it was his intention to call together early in the new year, that is in 1964, this year, a meeting of all of the attorneys-generals of Canada to discuss the Constitution -- the domiciling of the amending procedure for The British North America Act. No correspondence was received in connection with this oral assurance, with the result that nothing emerged from that announcement at all -- subsequently, of course, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Chevrier, was appointed to a high diplomatic position in London and his position as Minister of Justice has only recently been taken over by the Honourable E. Favreau. In this intervening period, of course, there has been the further development taking place, the establishment of the Committee on Biculturalism, Bilingualism, which I understand has some

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . connotations attached to it which will enable it to review at least some of the constitutional problems of Canada.

Taking into account all of these facts -- taking into account all of the representations that had been made and the change in political and other circumstances which had occurred from the time the proposed draft act was first produced, it was felt by the committee -- and I believe I can say that it was felt unanimously by the committee when it came to consider what its report should be to the House -- that our report should be very brief but it should not constitute a detailed review of this act because one does not know to what extent today this act represents at all the feelings of the different provinces who participated in the discussions now going on three years old. But it was felt that the act had -- the proposed act -- did represent, perhaps the furthest step forward that had even been taken since 1867 to effect the domiciling of the amending procedure in Canada, and we felt as a committee that that statement should be made, having regard to the fact that in our original resolution this House, I believe, unanimously, agreed that this was a desirable end. That is, that the amending procedure should be domiciled in Canada and not in the United Kingdom as at present. And so the first statement of the committee was that the proposed draft act represents a positive step forward in the search for a formula whereby Canada may amend its constitutions without reference to the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

And the second proposal, or recommendation of the committee was that the Government of Manitoba request the Government of Canada to reopen the Federal-Provincial Conferences with a view to carrying forward the progress made at earlier conferences, and arriving at an agreed procedure for the amending of the British-North America Act in Canada. And really the import of those two recommendations is that this House should go on record as acknowledging the progress that was made -- the great progress that was made, may I say, in arriving at this first draft Amendment Act; and secondly, that the House should then invite the Government of Canada to reconvene these conferences and to use as a starting point for their consideration of this important matter, the draft act or the debate which proceeded that draft act as a starting point. In other words, to suggest to them, I think in a kindly way, that all of this work which was done should not now be cast to one side, but rather it should represent the firm foundation upon which further discussions might proceed between the Dominion Government, the Federal Government and the provinces. And this is not felt to be, as I've said, a statement in detail of any kind at all. We felt that it was not desirable at this stage to hamper or to inhibit in any way, by detailed recommendations or comments upon this draft act, the representatives that Manitoba might send to such a conference. He should be free, we felt, without any inhibitions from the House -- he should be free to move into these negotiations with this general background of support from the Legislature and then to proceed into the negotiations and to achieve that degree of agreement that is possible in a matter of so delicate a nature, and in a matter of such great importance to the future of our whole country. So this submission is made, Madam Speaker. I commend it to the House. I trust that there will be approval for this report of the committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I have just a couple of questions in this regard. My recollection is that when this matter was last discussed in this Chamber, that we made arrangements for the writing into Hansard or into the Journals, a copy of that proposed draft act. Is that correct? And my other question is: Was it in the Journals or in Hansard? And my other question is: was that a year ago, or two years ago?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, as a member of this committee, I feel that this is a resolution which should receive the unanimous support of the House. It's true that it deals with a method of domiciling the Canadian Constitution in Canada, which may not be perfect in all its aspects and respects, but nevertheless, it's the best formula that has yet been devised and I feel that as a basis for further negotiations it would eventually lead to something which would give to Canada the right of amending its own constitution. I also feel too, Madam, that there are a number of matters which are at present vested in the Federal Parliament with exclusive jurisdiction there, and this formula which has been devised, provides a method or means by which the Federal Government can enter into an agreement with the province regarding the renting or leasing out of certain jurisdictions. I feel that that is a matter which is very important, particularly to the Province of Manitoba, in respect of certain items which can properly be

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) considered as falling within the definition of property and civil rights. I know that it's against the rules of the House to refer to any resolution which is in the process of being debated in this House, but if the House will excuse me, there is one resolution, that is, respecting the grounds for divorce, where in my opinion, there is very little possibility of the Federal Parliament ever amending its divorce laws and I think that the only hope that we have is for the Federal Parliament to enter into an agreement with the province, giving the province the right to take over that particular jurisdiction. So for these reasons, Madam, I would urge that this resolution receive the unanimous support of the House.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, as a member of the committee, and partly in response to the remarks of the last speaker, I would like to say that we in this group will endorse the resolution in the sense that at least one thing that signifies progress is the fact the discussion is taking place. On the other hand, if we vote along with the others, indicating our approval, I wouldn't want it to be construed that we support the proposed draft act in its entirety, but far from it. In fact the unanimity feature of the proposal is so unacceptable to us, that we simply reject it outright. It seems to me absurd that we should be taking seriously a proposal for domiciling the Constitution which requires that there must be unanimity among provinces before the Constitution can be amended. In fact, there is no constitution in the world today that has such a feature. Well, without prolonging the remarks, Madam Speaker, I just want to make it clear that the only reason we join to show unanimity is that it is desirable to domicile the Constitution, but certainly we have grave reservations about the unanimity clause.

MR. LYON: In response to the Honourable Member . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, just a few words. I was not on the committee and am not as conversant on this matter by any stretch of the imagination as the other members of this House, especially those that served on the committee.

I remember somewhat the report that was brought in at an earlier stage and from what I gather I was in accordance with it at that time. However, before voting for this, I would have to honestly say that I'm not fully aware of all the implications and therefore could not make an intelligent vote in this case.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to comment or ask questions. I'll close the debate by responding first of all to the Honourable Member from Lakeside. The actual draft of the act can be found in the 1963 Journals at page 39, the 13th of March -- page 39, the 13th of March -- and I believe as well, if my memory serves me, that the draft act also appeared in the 1962 Hansard and in the 1962 Journals. So I think it's amply recorded for posterity -- if posterity ever wants to take a look at it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Plus two excellent speeches.

MR. LYON: Plus two excellent speeches, the honourable member reminds me. One by the Honourable Member from Lakeside and the other one, I forget who made it.

I appreciate the comments of the Honourable Member from Selkirk, the Honourable Member from Brokenhead with respect to this report. I can certainly agree with the Honourable Member from Brokenhead that the committee would not necessarily have approved of every section of this draft act and that is why the recommendation forthcoming from the committee was in general terms because I believe on introducing the act, in 1962, I stated to the House that there were a number of provisions in it which I, as an individual speaking on behalf of the government, felt were too far into the field of entrenchment, but that we should consider them in the light of their being the closest that we could come to our own position and yet achieve some communion of agreement with the other provinces represented. So certainly, in approving and in voting for this resolution, neither the government nor any member of the House, is necessarily approving of each section of this draft amendment bill. Quite the contrary would be the case. We are approving, I would think of the principle -- the general principle expressed in the bills, congratulating those who participated if you will, for having achieved this amount of agreement and wishing well to those who participate in the future, that they can work from this base and go on, we hope, to greater and better things and to the domiciling of this amending procedure in Canada. It does seem a strange thing that in a sovereign country, fast approaching its 100th year of existence, that we have not been able to find the key to an amending procedure whereby we can have that one item that remains in our whole spectrum of

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . national self-determination, the power to change our own constitution. This has eluded us for almost a hundred years. I hope that Providence will guide those who look into this matter in the future so that they can grasp this key because, while it is not practically a tremendously important thing, yet in terms of national self-interest, and in terms of the development of a nation, it really augers poorly for the country that is unable to find the key to amending its own constitution. So I think this should be set before all of the provinces -- and the federal authority as well -- as a goal to achieve by 1967, and I know that to that end Manitoba will not be wanting in striving to achieve that goal.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that whereas this House on the second day of May, 1963, at the first session of the 27th legislature received a Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, hereinafter called the committee, in which report there appears at pages 244 to 247 of the Journals of the Legislature for the 1963 session, and whereas in the report received on the second day of May, 1963, the committee stated that it had examined all regulations referred to it by resolution of the House, have from Thursday the 14th day of March, 1963, being Manitoba regulation 10 of 61 to 76 of 61, and 1 of 62 to 9 of 62, and made certain recommendations with respect thereto, and whereas no resolution has been passed by the House with respect to the report of the committee received by the House on the second of May 1963, and whereas this House on the tenth of February, 1964, at this session of the 27th Legislature received a further report of the committee in which the committee stated that it had examined Manitoba regulations 10 of 62 to 105 of 62, and 1 of 63 to 15 of 63 and made certain recommendations with respect thereto, and whereas section 12 of The Regulations Act provides that any authority making a regulation, or, in the case of an Order-in-Council, the Minister recommending it upon receiving from the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly a copy of the resolution of the Assembly showing disapproval of the regulation or any part thereof, or requiring amendment, the authority or Minister shall give effect to the resolution. Therefore be it resolved that this House doth concur in the Reports of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders received by this House on the second day of May, 1963, at the first session of the 27th Legislature, and on the 10th day of February, 1964, at this session of the 27th Legislature, and also in the recommendations made therein and which appear in the Order Paper.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, two brief comments only, the first being that last year at the last session, through oversight, after the report of the committee was presented, there did not follow the necessary motion of concurrence that is required for the House to approve or disapprove of the report of the committee. That report of concurrence is now sought in this resolution which is before you with respect to the report of the committee which was tendered to this House last year. I regret the oversight but I can assure members of the House no practical prejudice resulted from it because the report, being a public one, was then distributed to the various departments of government and I think some action has already been forthcoming upon the report, even though it has not received formally the concurrence of the House. The second matter is with respect to the question raised in an earlier debate by the Honourable Member from Lakeside, and has to do with the report of the committee reviewing the regulations of -- I think that was the earlier report -- 1961. In that regard, I believe the question asked by the Honourable Member was whether or not the Minister was anticipating the report of the committee. I think from time to time it is desirable perhaps that ministers should anticipate the report of the committee, where, through the interrogations and reviews of the committee, the law officers of the Crown and the committee members themselves find something to be in error. I've always been of the opinion that this information, especially if it's of a serious nature at all, should be conveyed immediately to the department concerned, if they are not already aware of it, in order that they may take such steps as to rectify the mistake or the omission, or the error, as may be required at that moment. This should not in any way impair the formal recognition of the report of the committee or the concurrence of the House in the committee's report. And so we will find from time to time actions having been

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . taken which anticipate actually the report of the committee and its concurrence of the House. I make comment again only that this is the third report that this committee has presented to the House, it now having been in existence for three years. It continues to do, in my opinion, extremely worthwhile work. All members of the committee participate in its work quite actively. We are very much indebted to the Legislative Council, the Clerk of this Assembly, for the contributions that they make to the work of the committee, and we can hope that its work will continue to progress in years that lie ahead.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I was waiting to see if any other member of the committee was planning to speak in this debate, because I am not a member of the committee and I would like to endorse what the chairman of the committee has said, that I think the committee does very useful work, and I would like to congratulate them on the achievements of the committee. I agree also with what the chairman has said in making the motion that, where some matter of any consequence at all, outside of a mere technicality, is called to attention, that the department should move rather than worrying about any procedure that might be thought to be anticipating the report. So far as the report of the committee, I have a couple of questions. The first one, I would like to know what is involved in paragraph 6, top of page 4, appears to be something dealing with the coarse grain marketing and I'd be interested to know just what the point is in regard to that situation. And on the same page, paragraph 8, is the one that I am inclined to disagree with. If I read it correctly, it says "the attention of the Department of Welfare Officials is to be brought to the irregularity of making retroactive regulations, and consideration should be given to amending The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act, The Blind Persons' Allowances Act, and The Old Age Assistance Act, to authorize retroactive regulations being made with respect to the matters dealt with in these regulations." If I get the import correctly, Madam Speaker, it is recommended here that Department of Welfare officials should have the right to retroactively authorize regulations. I think I must be interpreting that wrongly, because I wouldn't think that this committee would make that recommendation. If I am interpreting it rightly, then I would heartily disagree until some good case is made for it, because I think government by regulation is something that we should be watching pretty carefully at any time, and to have officials making regulations is something that I disapprove of much more than the Cabinet Council making the regulations, and then to have officials making regulations retroactively, I think would be carrying improper procedure to great lengths. So if I have read that one correctly I would like to express strong disapproval of it, and would ask the chairman of the committee to give us some further representations with regard to it.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move that debate be adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move Madam Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have before us Resolution 6 of Department II, the Executive Council.

MR. MOLGAT: It has been requested that this be left open for me, as I had to be absent at this time yesterday. I see from Hansard that the First Minister gave a list of the grants which I had requested, and that is satisfactory for me. I would only make the suggestion for next year, if he supplied a sheet with us then we wouldn't have to have him read them out in the House.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on this very point, could we have some information from the Minister whether there were any applications from rural parts of the province, and whether there were any of those rejected.

MR. ROBLIN: To the best of my recollection, no, Mr. Chairman. We did get some. Some of these are from rural Manitoba, and they were approved. I can't recall any. If members opposite got other information they might remind me but I don't remember any.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, it does raise rather an interesting

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd.) . . . point, though. In looking over the list of bodies and organizations that have received grants, I judge that they are all from Winnipeg, and if organizations of a similar nature from rural Manitoba made application, would they receive consideration? I note that the Manitoba Museum is going to get a larger grant, I believe, in '64 than it has in the past, due to the matching grant formula, which is a good one. And now that the Centennial -- Centennials -- there are two of them coming along, several rural areas are considering the building of museums to commemorate the Centennials, and I wonder if provincial grants may be made available for these as well.

MR. ROBLIN: It's impossible to say on that, Mr. Chairman, but I wouldn't be optimistic that there is a possibility of providing grants for all the various organizations in each part of the province that might have a requirement. There are just too many, and the proportionate grants would be so small to put them on a proportionate basis, that it would not be a great deal of assistance. We do expect we'll be able to help some of these organizations if they're put forward by their local municipal body for centennial purposes. Hope we'll be able to help some in that respect in that case. One of the arguments that many of these bodies put to us when they come before us is the fact that they do a good deal of travelling around the province in their particular field. It isn't true of the museum, but it's true of others. But these are questions which you just have to settle on an ad hoc basis trying to be as fair as you can.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister brought up a point. Is this where we are to discuss the Centennial?

MR. ROBLIN: No, I merely raised that point, because my honourable friend behind him touched on it, but the Centennial comes under the Provincial Secretary.

MR. MOLGAT: Under Provincial Secretary. Fine, thank you.

MR. ROBLIN: I would say it's not in "current" as far as I know. It's in "capital", but it will be discussed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 6 -- Passed. Resolution 7 -- (a), (b) -- passed. (c) --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, there's a substantial increase in (c). Now, possibly there's been an explanation made of this. I don't know. I wonder if the Minister could give us some details.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, we are instituting some additional grants to the public libraries of the province this year. These will be additional grants to the municipal and regional libraries established under the provisions of The Public Libraries Act. Basically, the system is quite simple. We will continue with the basic grants in accordance with the formula that has been followed now for a number of years, \$2,000 for each municipality if it's a regional library, or \$2,000 to the municipality if it's a municipal library. The increase comes in an additional grant, and I wish to make it quite clear that this additional amount is added to the basic grant. The additional amount is based on a percentage formula and will be made up as follows: 30 percent of the first \$10,000 raised by local taxation for library purposes, 30 percent of the first \$10,000, 10 percent of the next \$10,000 raised by local taxation for library purposes, and 5 percent of any sum in excess of \$20,000 raised by local taxation for library purposes. And members of the committee will note that these additional grants then are based on not -- I don't know whether one could say a "matching" formula, although that in essence is the concept. They are related to the monies raised by local taxation for library purposes, and it is estimated that in the current year these additional grants will require approximately some 80 thousand-odd dollars, and they will be paid out. We were not able to calculate, because of course we don't know, and won't know for a little time yet, the amounts raised by local taxation for library purposes in the year 1964, but just making a calculation on the basis of what we do know for the year 1963, for example, that each library -- each municipal library and each regional library -- would receive some sum of money in addition to the basic grants.

MR. MOLGAT: I note that the Establishment Grant is down substantially. Is the Minister not anticipating as active a development of libraries in the future?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, under the law as amended by the legislature, the Establishment Grant in the year 1964-65 -- that's the fiscal year we're considering now -- Establishment Grants are paid in respect of libraries that voted to establish themselves in 1963. Now, there were only two that are eligible by reason of a successful vote. Ten thousand dollars Establishment Grant will be paid in respect of Assiniboia and Charleswood, who had a vote and

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . approved the establishment of regional libraries to serve their municipalities, and \$2,000 will be paid to the Lakeland regional library, because the Village of Glenboro voted to become part of the Lakeland regional library. That's the regional library that was established before. This is under the provision that allows an Establishment Grant of \$2,000 in the case of a municipal corporation voting to join and already existing. Twelve thousand dollars is all that's required for that purpose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the figure here is \$4,000. How does that compare with the \$12,000?

MR. McLEAN: No, 12 on the right-hand side?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) -- passed. (d) --

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in connection with (d), may I first of all -- I could have done it on item (a) -- I do it now. I would like to express my appreciation and I'm sure that of the members of my group, for the services which are provided by the staff of the library to we members. It is indeed gratifying for us to know that we have within the department and the library so qualified individuals that even on the sentences asking for very sketchy information, they're so qualified that they can even interpret what we have in our minds and produce the documents that we are asking for. And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of myself and my group, how much I appreciate the staff of the library.

Now, we received a document just today, Mr. Chairman, that was addressed to the Honourable Stewart McLean, as Minister in charge of libraries and historical research, and just on a superficial glance of some of the papers that have been read before the Historical Society, I note there's one here dealing with the Roblin government and the election of 1911 by B. Margolis. I wonder if there is one in process of being written of the Roblin government in the election of 1962, and if we might have such a document before too long in order to compare the differences between 1911 and one Roblin, and the present Roblin.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . qualified to be an expert on the '62 election.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I rose before my leader, then I respected him and allowed him to speak first, and he mentioned the words I intend to utter, but he did it in a more romantic English, and this is to commend the library staff.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, under Item (d), Archives and Historical Research, I noted that last June, a two-year \$25,000 archeological study began in the area of Lockport. Apparently they have found that there were highly concentrated village populations there centuries ago, and I understand that the provincial government have donated \$15,000 to initiate this work, and I was just looking at the item. I see where it has only been increased by \$2,560. Where can I find in the estimates some portion of the \$15,000 which is to be spent on archeological work around Lockport?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I would like to ask the Minister whether or not Lower Fort Garry comes under this item? The restoration -- which department would that be in -- Mines?

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mines and Resources, I think, under the Parks.

MR. CAMPBELL: I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the report that's just put on our desks today mentions that the Archives staff have been assisting a Winnipeg architect who is dealing with the restoration of Lower Fort Garry. Is there something contemplated in that regard.

MR. ROBLIN: One of the Honourable Members inquired about archeological work at Lockport. This is a project which has been going on since June 1st '63 under the auspices of the University of Manitoba and through Dr. William J. Mayer-Oaks. The cost is estimated at \$25,000 and a \$15,000 grant has been forthcoming from the Manitoba government, and the balance from the University and from the National Museum of Canada. I think that's the information my honourable friend wanted.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? (d) passed. Resolution . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, there's no item this year for the Royal Commission. Is this to be taken then that there are no expenses in cleaning up the work of the Commission -- everything has been covered in last year's . . . ?

MR. ROBLIN: We think we have enough money to pay for the balance of this Commission's work already voted, so we don't require any more -- already provided one way or another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Treasury, Resolution 8 (1) Item, Administration. (a)

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend across wanted to know the salary of the Deputy Minister -- \$16,000, an increase of \$500 from last year. He also receives a \$3,000 emolument as a member of the Hydro Board. And regarding executive assistants, there is one on my staff. At the present time, he's not working for me. He's been to the Royal Commission since it began, and they're paying his salary, but when that is through I hope to have him back.

MR. PAULLEY: Which Royal Commission?

MR. ROBLIN: The one on Local Government Organization and Finance. But I haven't seen him since he went over there. He's been busy.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What is his salary when he's working for the First Minister?

MR. ROBLIN: \$6,690 per annum.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is his salary the same for the Commission, or is the Minister aware of his salary there?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm really not aware of it, but I expect it is the same. There's no reason why it should be different.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did the Minister, say \$6,600?

MR. ROBLIN: \$6,690.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this would be the item under which the Minister would give us some information regarding the bonds -- the short term debentures sold last year? He had another issue, I think, of some \$13 million of the provincial bonds last year in the province. The previous year he had \$40 million, or rather two years ago \$40 million; a year before \$20 million; last year \$13 million. He was good enough to give us the redemption figures in each case and I wonder if he could give us the balance of redemption figures from January, or rather, February of '63 onward.

MR. ROBLIN: the accounts for the last fiscal year. I haven't any information apart from that at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: On a monthly basis?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think they're on a monthly basis. On consideration, I'm not inclined to give that information on a monthly basis. I don't mind giving it on the overall basis, but I really don't think I should do it on a monthly basis. Though I did it before, on thinking the matter over, I decided it's not a good idea.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, then I can only assume the Minister doesn't like the figures he's had to give us, because he was quite prepared to give them to us before. Last year on my request, he gave us the Savings Bond redemption month by month on both issues. The \$40 million issue which was the first at 5 percent he gave us all the details until February of '63. The second issue of \$20 million at 4-3/4 percent and the redemption that started in October of '63 and carried on, he gave us the figures up to February. Now, if he's not prepared to give us the information this year, I can only assume that figures are not encouraging. Why else would he be prepared last year to give us this information and not now?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't mind giving the bulk figures.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, is it a fair question to ask what the assistant's name is? The name of the

MR. ROBLIN: If you want to know it's a Mr. J. E. Martin.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister, how many of the people employed in the Treasury Department are certified chartered accountants?

MR. ROBLIN: department?

MR. FROESE: No, the Treasury Department.

MR. ROBLIN: No, I don't think any of them are certified chartered accountants, Mr. Chairman. I think most of the accountants we have are in the Comptroller-General's Department. I may be wrong at that. I just have the names of the particular classifications that they're under. They do not say whether they're chartered accountants or not and I haven't got that information. It might be that the Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. McFee, is one, but I'm not positive on that score.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder, if the First Minister could give me the details so that I can make the comparison exactly with the previous two issues of savings bonds. I think he gave

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . the figure yesterday -- is it \$13 million?

MR. ROBLIN: \$ 13 million, I think and \$36.00.

MR. MOLGAT: And \$36.00.

MR. ROBLIN: Call it \$13 million. I won't quarrel with you.

MR. MOLGAT: And the rate on that one was how much -- 4-3/4?

MR. ROBLIN: 4-3/4 -- 4.99 if held to maturity.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, no, I find it rather interesting that this venture that was gone into by my honourable friend opposite has been having steadily poorer results. In fact my impression is that the last issue was a flop. It brought in a very small amount of money by comparison with the previous two and, in addition as I recall, it had to be extended over a long period of time. My honourable friend is always telling us how it reflects the strength of his administration and so on. Well if this is so, I think that the reflection is not to his credit, because from the first at \$40 million, the next at \$20 million, and the last at \$13 million, if he accepts it as a reflection of the public approval and the confidence in his administration, well that satisfies me, but I would be pleased to have his views on the subject. Does he intend to have another savings bond issue this year?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I'll make any statement about another savings bond this year at the present time in any definitive sense. The matter is being looked into and it is probable.

I think that my honourable friend's criticism really doesn't pack much of a punch on this point. There are two considerations: first, how much money do you actually want? I think we received enough money at this particular issue to cover our needs and I'm confident that we probably will have as satisfactory result on other issues. But, I think the point is really extremely simple. If you want more money you raise the price, you offer more. And when you consider that the Manitoba Savings Bond issue which he criticizes because it only raised \$13 million, was issued at the time when it would pay the public more to go and buy Canada Savings Bonds -- which I guess I must admit, are just as good a buy as Manitoba Savings Bonds, I think we didn't do badly. I think that if we want a lot more money, the question simply is, you just offer a little higher coupon and you get it. But the coupon rate we offered was satisfactory for our purposes from two points of view. First it did raise enough money for our purposes; and secondly, it raised it at a very economical rate, which as I say was cheaper than Canada Savings Bonds could be sold for at that particular time.

Now, I think that one just has to deal with each issue of savings bonds on this particular financial circumstances at the time. If you want a large sum of money, then I think you raise your rate a little and you'll probably get it. But I wouldn't really feel at all concerned about the results of last year's bond issue.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman I hope and pray that the Provincial Treasurer will not be discouraged by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and do sell bonds for a long time, and irrespective whether the premium is an eighth of a cent higher or lower, it won't break the government, but it will help the people of the province and get them interested and perhaps, the Honourable the Treasurer would not have to go every week-end to New York, begging them for a couple of dollars.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I sat back enjoying the debate between the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the House, the Provincial-Treasurer, in reference to the bond issue of last year of \$13 million. The First Minister indicated that he was satisfied to receive the \$13 million, but I wonder whether this is actually the case though, when we take a look at the figures that were tabulated and presented to us yesterday in the Budget Speech. The net gain as far as the Treasury of Manitoba on savings bonds of last year only is \$7.7 million because of the retirement of the savings bonds of the three issues, but mainly the issue of April 1st, '61, April 1st, '62, and June 1st, '63. Now it might be correct as the Provincial Treasurer mentioned a moment or two ago, that the government was in pretty tough competition with the Government of Canada last year on the sale of its bonds, because of the interest rates. I wonder if the Honourable the Provincial-Treasurer could say the same thing in respect of the two previous issues, whether this was equally true? Because, the issue of April 1st, 1961, maturing in April 1971, the interest rate on those particular bonds was 5%, and it seems to me, if I'm reading the statement correctly, there were \$2-1/2 million

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . of these bonds retired, so say that the net gain last year to the Treasury, according to this statement, was only \$7.7 million. Now this raises one or two questions in my mind. First of all that the obvious, the net gain was only \$7.7 million; the other fact is that there were, insofar as the issue of '61 is concerned, there were \$2-1/2 million redeemed and the issue of '62, \$2 million. Now, I don't know much about the manipulations of finance and the turnover of bonds or the likes of this, and I'd like to hear from the Provincial-Treasurer, if he has any comments, as to whether these figures of redemption are out of line with what general redemptions are within the maturity period of ten years.

MR. ROBLIN: I think my honourable friend's grasp of the situation is pretty good. I don't think he need offer any excuses for that, he's got the point. These savings bonds are cash money. After they've been in the hands of the lender for six months, they're cash money. If he wants to go to Florida, or buy a new house, or whatever he might have been saving his money for, he just sends us in a note and says, "I want my cash" and you let him have it.

Now this is characteristic of all savings bonds of this type. It applies to the one sold by the Dominion of Canada; it applies to the one sold in Saskatchewan and I also believe it applies to the one sold in British Columbia. They're all of the same general nature, they're cash money. That is why it is not possible to finance the whole of any government's requirements by the use of this method. There are definite limitations to it. And it might be suggested that when we have \$50 or \$60 million or more out on what is, on this kind of a financing project, which in effect is cash money, that there are limitations, and I must say this to my honourable friend from Inkster to his disappointment, I think, that you cannot use this form of financing for all public purposes. It has its place, but it's a matter of judgment as to how far you should go and what liability you should have outstanding and what protective measures you have, should the whole thing by any terrible fluke of circumstances be called in at once. So you have to accept, when you adopt this form of financing -- you have to accept the definite fact that every month, or every year, or whatever, you'll be asked to redeem some of this money and that in turn means it's necessary to find some replacement for the money that's redeemed -- you either issue new savings bonds, as we have done, or you issue another form of security, or whatever you like. But you do face that and we've never made any bones about this, this isn't anything new to tell the Chamber this, this is a fact we know. Now all that we say is that our redemption on Manitoba Savings Bonds is a perfectly acceptable and satisfactory rate for this method of financing and that it compares satisfactorily with Canada Savings Bonds or other methods of similar savings bond issues. So we do have these definite encashments all the time -- the Leader of the Opposition spoke about them. He'll find them shown in the Public Accounts. I think they're on page 47, or somewhere around there, and he'll find them all listed there and we have to accept that situation and that's the fact. However, in view of all the circumstances, we still feel that this is a good thing to do for the reasons often expressed by the Honourable Gentleman from Inkster, and other members from the House as well, and our rate of redemption is one that we're quite satisfied with.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, as I scan the financial pages from time to time, it seems to me that we're in a period of boom insofar as banks are concerned in the Dominion. It seems that the former director of the Bank of Canada is going to venture into the banking industry and set up a new bank -- I believe he met with my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, a few days ago. I note that the government that has the wholehearted support out in B.C., which has the wholehearted support of the Honourable Member from Rhineland, seems to be entering into the banking business out on the west coast, I wonder if the Provincial-Treasurer could inform the House as to whether or not there is a possibility of us getting back into a provincial bank here in the Province of Manitoba; or whether, with all the money that he has at his disposal, that we hear so much about, that he, as Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Manitoba, may be contemplating becoming a director or a shareholder in any particular bank.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I've recently had an invitation to join the board of any bank, if I had I'm afraid I couldn't accept it. It might be considered to be a clash of interests. However, I must say that the Provincial Government is certainly in the banking business in no small way, or perhaps I ought to say a form of finance business in no small way, first of all with the Agricultural Credit Fund, which now has \$22 million account

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) to finance, and also the Manitoba Development Fund which is a multi-million dollar money lending corporation as well. So, while I'm interested to observe what these other provinces are doing, we've been in this business for some time, for the last five years and we think that as far as these two organizations are concerned that they're well worth the public support that we put into them. But I'm really not contemplating, at the present time at any rate, being able to invite my honourable friend to buy some shares in some new bank that we may be interested in.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to say to my honourable friend Mr. Chairman, that I have lots of shares in the Province of Manitoba, albeit it may not be in a bank in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.